

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

EDWARD ALBERT STENBERG,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 20-cv-10674  
Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

CORIZON HEALTH, INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT PREJUDICE PLAINTIFF’S RENEWED  
MOTION FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION (ECF No. 86)**

Plaintiff Edward Albert Stenberg is a state prisoner in the custody of the Michigan Department of Corrections (the “MDOC”). In this action, Stenberg brings several claims arising out of allegedly inadequate medical treatment that he received while incarcerated. (*See* Am. Compl., ECF No. 74.) He brings his claims against, among others, several employees of the MDOC (Defendants Brown, Jeb Bush, Cook, Jodi Deangelo, Richard Harbaugh, Howe, Halee Jordan, Nathan Neusbaum, Lori Porter, Paul Schreiber, and Jeffery Stieve) (collectively, the “MDOC Defendants”) and MDOC contractor Corizon Health, Inc. (“Corizon”) and several of Corizon’s employees (Defendants Corizon Health, Inc., Hill, Matthew Kasper, and Ankhiet Tran) (collectively the “Corizon Defendants”). (*See id.*)

On April 9, 2021, Stenberg filed a renewed motion for a preliminary injunction. (*See* Mot., ECF No. 86.) In the motion, Stenberg seeks an injunction that (1) “enjoin[s] any Defendant, and those acting in concert with them, from retaliating against [him], including by denying him access to health professionals as his medical needs arise” and (2) “requires Defendants to provide appropriate dental, medical, and pain management specialists independent of the [MDOC] or Corizon to consult with [him] and recommend an appropriate course of treatment.” (*Id.*, PageID.1353-1354.) The MDOC Defendants and the Corizon Defendants oppose the motion. (*See* Corizon Resp., ECF No. 96; MDOC Resp., ECF No. 99.) The Court held a hearing on the motion on October 21, 2021.

For the reasons discussed during the October 21 motion hearing, Stenberg’s motion is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. As the Court explained on the record, Stenberg’s request for the above-described injunctive relief is moot because the named Defendants no longer have control over his medical care.

The Court begins with the MDOC Defendants. All of the MDOC Defendants work at one of two prisons where Stenberg was formerly incarcerated: either the Woodland Correctional Facility or the Charles Egeler Reception and Guidance Center. However, Stenberg is no longer incarcerated at either of those two facilities. Indeed, it is undisputed that Stenberg is now incarcerated at the Lakeland Correctional Facility (“LCF”). And Stenberg has not provided any evidence that

any of the MDOC Defendants have the authority to provide him medical care at LCF or the ability to refer him to outside specialists now that he is incarcerated at a different facility. Nor has he shown how those Defendants could retaliate against him given that he no longer resides at their facilities. Finally, as Stenberg's counsel candidly acknowledged at the motion hearing, any objection Stenberg has to the medical care that he is currently receiving at LCF is not at issue in this action. In any event, Stenberg has not provided any evidence that the medical professionals at LCF are providing him inadequate medical care or are retaliating against him. For all of these reasons, Stenberg is not entitled to his requested injunction against the MDOC Defendants.

For many of the same reasons, Stenberg has likewise failed to persuade the Court that he is entitled to an injunction against the Corizon Defendants. During the motion hearing, Corizon's counsel represented to the Court that as of October 1, 2021, Corizon is no longer providing contracted medical services to the MDOC or its inmates. Thus, because Stenberg has not shown that the Corizon Defendants are still involved in his medical care, he is not entitled to a preliminary injunction against them.

If Stenberg discovers evidence that any of the MDOC or Corizon Defendants remain involved in his medical care, he may file a renewed motion for preliminary injunction against those Defendants at that time.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Matthew F. Leitman  
MATTHEW F. LEITMAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: October 22, 2021

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on October 22, 2021, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Monda  
Case Manager  
(810) 341-9764